UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,900	04/11/2005	Warren Thomas Johnson	2002P87057WOUS	9243
28524 SIEMENS COF	7590 04/30/201 RPORATION	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			ANDERSON, DENISE R	
ISELIN, NJ 088	/ENUE SOUTH 830	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/30/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/530,900	JOHNSON, WARREN THOMAS		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Denise R. Anderson	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(fextensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE c). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL (a) and the appropriate (b) the fee. The appropriate (c) and the final Office (c) and the final Office (d) and the final Office	e extension fee ate extension; or (2) as
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	TE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all			
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☑ will ided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>10-13 and 15-36</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Walter D. Griffin/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The request for reconsideration puts forth arguments that were previously addressed in the final rejection, in an office action dated February 19, 2009. The arguments are listed below, with the office action paragraphs cited that addresses each argument.

- 1. Applicant argues that Ide teaches it is undesirable to operate a membrane filtration apparatus to displace liquid from within an aeration hood shrouding the membranes. Applicant further argues that the Horii method would not have been modified by Ide. From the previous office action, please see paragraph 4, Table 1, the Horii figures on p. 6, and the patentability analysis incorporating Ide for explicitly teaching the enclosed aeration hood in paragraphs 17-19. As such, the limitation is met that recites "the aeration hood configured and arranged such that a gas fed into the aeration hood will displace feed liquid and lower a level of feed liquid in the aeration hood."
- 2. Applicant argues that the sleeves or open-ended tubes are not taught by any of the references. From the previous office action, please see paragraph 4, Table 1, p. 6 figures, and paragraphs 8 and 14-16 for the patentability analysis incorporating Cote et al. for explicitly teaching the sleeves or open-ended tubes.
- 3. Applicant argues that Horii, Cote et al., and Ide are not combinable. Regarding Horii, in view of Cote et al., please see Point 2 above. Regarding Horii, in view of Cote et al., in view of Ide, please see Point 1 above.
- 4. Applicant argues that the references do not teach the claim 20 limitation of "at least one aeration opening in a wall of the aeration hood positioned adjacent to the open region." From the previous office action, please see paragraph 20, the Table 2 entries for "Aeration hood," "Aeration opening," and "Open region." As such, the limitation is met.
- 5. Applicant argues that the references do not disclose extending the sleeve or tube partially along the length of the membrane module, as recited in independent claims 20, 22, and 27. From the previous office action, please see paragraph 20, Table 2, the Horii figures on p. 6, and the patentability analysis for this limitation in paragraphs 25 and 26, including the figures.